

**From:** Kluesner, Dave [kluesner.dave@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 5/5/2014 9:29:01 PM  
**To:** Kelley, Sophia [Kelley.JessicaSophia@epa.gov]; Yeh, Alice [Yeh.Alice@epa.gov]; Ayala, Wanda [Ayala.Wanda@epa.gov]; Karlen, Delmar [Karlen.Delmar@epa.gov]; Butler, Elizabeth [Butler.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Schaaf, Eric [Schaaf.Eric@epa.gov]; Flanagan, Sarah [Flanagan.Sarah@epa.gov]; Hick, Patricia [Hick.Patricia@epa.gov]; LaPadula, John [LaPadula.John@epa.gov]; LaPoma, Jennifer [LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Nace, Charles [Nace.Charles@epa.gov]; Naranjo, Eugenia [Naranjo.Eugenia@epa.gov]; Olsen, Marian [Olsen.Marian@epa.gov]; Basso, Ray [Basso.Ray@epa.gov]; Sebastian, Chris [Sebastian.Chris@epa.gov]; Vaughn, Stephanie [Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]; Wagner, Amelia [Wagner.Amelia@epa.gov]; Mugdan, Walter [Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Bellow, Bonnie [Bellow.Bonnie@epa.gov]; Mears, Mary [Mears.Mary@epa.gov]; McGowan, Michael [McGowan.Michael@epa.gov]; Plevin, Lisa [Plevin.Lisa@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** FW: Results of the May 1 Passaic CAG Meeting  
**Attachments:** Results of the 5.1 Passaic CAG Meeting.docx; ATT00001.htm

I am forwarding the Passaic River CAG May 1 meeting summary. The CAG leadership, through their facilitator, has provided EPA with this summary to advise the agency on its positions and questions to-date in advance of our May 7 meeting.

**[Contents of the attachment are copied and pasted below]**

### **Results of the 5/1/14 Passaic CAG Meeting**

#### **CAG Position:**

The CAG will express general support for proposed cleanup plan, with questions about potential impacts to the community, and other issues of community concern.

#### **CAG Activities During the Public Comment Period**

- The CAG will be producing a fact sheet and talking points to ensure that accurate and community-oriented information is provided.
- The CAG will develop an overview and the pros and cons it considered with regard to a CAD cell.
- CAG members are asked to make sure they are connecting extensively with their constituencies and sharing news of CAG positions and information.
- CAG members are strongly encouraged to attend at least one EPA public hearing and testify as an individual, not on behalf of the CAG.
- TASC will review FFS and PP to identify potential impacts on the community and where additional questions or information may be needed.
- The CAG hopes to have a formal statement prepared in time to testify at the final EPA public meeting.
- The CAG will seek to connect with the Hudson River CAG to understand key lessons learned from that experience, particularly with respect to local economic opportunities and community impacts from the clean up.
- The CAG will not request an extension to the public comment period.
- The CAG will be presenting formal and detailed comments to EPA.

## Key Issues of Concern to the CAG, and Associated Questions

- **CAD cells v. off-site disposal.** The CAG supports off-site disposal and does not wish to see a CAD cell in Newark Bay.
  - Where else are CAD cells being built (New Bedford) and what are the contaminants, conditions, and volume there?
  - How do the tidal shift and high volume of commercial traffic in Newark Bay affect a CAD cell?
  - What have other agencies said?
- **Navigation Channel.** The CAG supports the navigational dredging.
  - What happens in this cleanup will affect the potential use of the river in perpetuity
  - This is important to Newark, Harrison, and Kearny, citizens there need to have ample opportunity to comment
  - The CAG would like to see port statistics
  - How will maintenance dredging be performed for the navigational channel with the cap in place?
- **Reasonably anticipated future use and natural resource restoration.** The CAG strongly recommends that these issues are taken into account during design and all possible coordination is conducted to ensure the future projects are not precluded unnecessarily. Future development along the river, including waterfront parks, is a critical component in community and river recovery.
  - Reasonably anticipated future use was not covered extensively by EPA and should be a key issue in all future activities. Design needs to take into account reasonable future use.
  - How will EPA be integrating restoration (including USACOE work) to ensure that possible future projects are not prevented by the cap and associated institutional controls?
  - How will EPA consider current and potential future public access (docks, boat ramps, lifts, moorings, etc.) into remediation?
  - A restored river means more desire for use and access. Can cap never be touched?
  - How will the remedy deal with the soft edges/littoral zone? Dilapidated bulkheads?
- **Bank-to-bank v. hot spot removal.** The CAG strongly supports a comprehensive approach, not a hot spot removal or Alternative 4 type of option.
- **Adaptive management.** The CAG seeks to understand how this will be applied.
  - How does EPA define this?
  - Need clarification on how the strategy will be used and who will have final say
  - Need to understand how this was done at Hudson River
- **Local job creation** and procurement of local support services. The CAG would like to continue the good record of access to jobs by local workers.
  - How will this be approached, where are the points in the process where the CAG can help to support this issue
- **Boating** on the river both during and following cleanup. The CAG wants to take access and ability to use the river into account in all phases. Significant restrictions on boat use following remediation significantly negates the value of restoring the river.
  - Will there be coordination with crew teams on barge schedules? What will be the impact of river use during construction?
  - How can we be assured that the cap that can withstand boat traffic and speed?
  - Permanent no wake zones, are these going to be instituted?
  - What will be the restrictions on anchoring in the cap area? Boats need to anchor.
  - Impact to rowing shells with the use of armor stone. Will biota layer be placed on top of stone/armor layer? The armor stone can ruin a shell.
- **Flooding.** The CAG wants to ensure that the remedy will not contribute to future flooding.

- What will be the sedimentation rate of the River with the dredge, including at the navigational channel? How will that contribute to flooding?
- **Incineration.**
  - What are the contaminants and triggers that will drive the amount of material requiring incineration at the disposal facility?
  - The CAG understand this incineration will be conducted at the off-site disposal facility and no local incineration will be conducted. Is this correct?
- **Bridges.** The CAG would like to see all possible efforts made to improve and coordinate the operations and traffic on 15 affected bridges well before the remedial design is complete.
  - The project should evaluate actual traffic and community impacts because of bridge movement, including use of actual data from the RM 10.9 removal action.
  - How will EPA work to assess fair distribution of cost to additional bridge operation?
  - What specifically will EPA be doing to assist the counties and cities on repairs and O&M of bridges?
- **Volume of Dioxin**
  - 18 pounds of dioxin does not seem like much, can EPA explain why this is important?
- **Coordination with other cleanup activities.**
  - What are the results of the CPG sampling and modeling of the upper nine miles of the river? How will this work be coordinated with the lower 8 activities?
  - What is the plan with area covered by Phase 2 of the AOC? Will that be handled separately? It no longer seems to make sense to separate this activity.
- **Additional design Questions that will require community input**
  - How will final dredging technology be selected?
  - What will the cap layers be made of?

---

**From:** Douglas Sarno [mailto:doug@forumfg.com]

**Sent:** Monday, May 05, 2014 3:21 PM

**To:** Stephanie Greenwood; Cynthia Mellon; Mehran, Reyhan (NOAA); Butler, Elizabeth; Yeh, Alice; Kirk Barrett; Robin Dougherty; Vaughn, Stephanie; Lisa Baron; James Mack; Jennifer Samson; Joe Nardone; Harvey Morginstin; Maribel Jusino-Iturralde; Arnold Cohen; David Yennior; debbie@nynjbaykeeper.org; Timothy Bal; Janine MacGregor; Molly Greenberg; Ben Delisle; Kluesner, Dave; Lenny Thomas; Thomas Pietrykoski; Ana Baptista; Massiel Ferrara; Roger Ellis; Christopher Caceres; Richard Plambeck; Jay Meegoda

**Subject:** Results of the May 1 Passaic CAG Meeting

Hi all,

Thanks everyone for the great meeting last Thursday, we had really good attendance, great conversation, and a good start to framing the CAG response and comments on the proposed plan.

Please find the summary of results from our meeting attached. It includes the general direction for the CAG and articulation of issues related to the EPA proposed plan. Please review and contact Anna or Debbie as soon as possible if you are not in agreement with the general approach being taken by the CAG.

Reminder that the first EPA public meeting is this Thursday May 7, 7 PM at the Portuguese Sports Club, 55 Prospect Street.

All CAG members are encouraged to attend the public meetings to hear what stakeholders are saying and to testify yourself as you see fit. Please remember that at this point all testimony is personal and should not be

presented as representing the CAG. It is hoped that the CAG will be in a position to provide consensus testimony by the final public meeting.

Please contact me with any questions that you may have

thanks

Doug